

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Final Office Action dated March 27, 2007. In accordance with the foregoing, Claims 1, 5, 6 and 10-12 are amended, and Claims 1, 3 and 5-12 are pending in the application. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the Specification as originally filed, for example, in paragraphs [0052], [0063], [0097] and [00114] to [00119] for the amendments to Claims 1, 5 and 6 and paragraph [0068] for the amendments to Claims 10-12. Of Claims 1, 3 and 5-12, Claims 1, 5 and 6 are independent. No new matter is presented in this response. Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 First Paragraph:

The Official Action rejects Claims 1, 3 and 5-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 1, 5 and 6

Page 2 of the Official Action states:

Claims 1, 5 and 6 claim a chucking device which temporarily places the chucking points closer to each other at a moment of lifting but does not provide adequate description of the structure or construction of the chucking device that can place chucking points closer to each other such that one skilled in the art can make or use the invention.

Claims 1, 5 and 6 have been amended to more clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter. In light of the amendments to the claims, this rejection is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection and reconsideration of Claims 1, 3 and 5-12.

Claims 10-12

The paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 of the Official Action states:

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the chuck of the tray drawer device being vertically and horizontally movable, does not reasonably provide enablement for the tray drawer device being vertically and horizontally movable.

Claims 10-12 have been amended to more clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter. In light of the amendments to the claims, this rejection is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection and reconsideration of Claims 10-12.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 Second Paragraph:

Claims 1, 3 and 5-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Official Action states:

Claim 1, 5 and 6 recite the limitation "the chucking points."
There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 1, 5 and 6 have been amended to more clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matter. In light of the amendments to the claims, this rejection is moot. Accordingly Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection and reconsideration of Claims 1, 3 and 5-12.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

The Official Action rejects Claims 1, 3 and 5-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Cochran et al., (IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (Vol. 20, No. 11B, April 1978) hereinafter "Cochran") in view of Anzelone et al. (IBM

Technical Disclosure Bulletin (Vol. 20, No. 11B, April 1978) hereinafter "Anzelone") and JP 6-255814 to Ando, et al. (hereinafter "Ando"). The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

For a proper obviousness rejection, the Patent Office must provide "some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness" and not "mere conclusory statements." KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007) (quoting In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988, (Fed. Cir. 2006)). For the Examiner to establish a factual basis to support a legal conclusion of obviousness, the Examiner must make the factual determinations set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 17, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (1966), KSR, 127 S.Ct. at 1734, 82 USPQ2d at 1391. The Official Action does not identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the elements of Cochran, Anzelone and Ando in the manner recited in Claim 1, 5 or 6. In addition, as stated in MPEP §2143, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim features. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added). The combination of Cochran, Anzelone and Ando does not teach or suggest all the claim features of Claim 1, 5 or 6.

Claims 1, 5 and 6 recite manufacturing apparatus for manufacturing electronic monolithic ceramic components, comprising, *inter alia*, each tray being adapted to hold at least one ceramic green sheet with carrier film and plurality of pin insertion holes, the plurality of ceramic green sheets being held in the plurality of trays according to type, a laminator for laminating the plurality of ceramic green sheets supplied by the sheet supplier, the laminator having a plurality of guide pins to penetrate the pin insertion holes, and a compression bonder configured to press

each ceramic green sheet lined with carrier film and placed on the laminator, to peel off the carrier film, and to discharge the peeled carrier film to a film discharger.

On page 4 of the Official Action, the Examiner states:

IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (Cochran et al.) discloses a stacking complex for stacking green sheets comprising:
 handlers 1 holding a plurality of trays 2 for delivering green sheets to an orientor, each tray holding greensheets separated by spacers (corresponds to sheet supplier including a plurality of trays each holding green sheets);
 stacking carrier onto which green sheets are stacked (corresponds to a laminator);
 vacuum transfer head 4 for transferring green sheets from a tray and conveying the green sheet to the stacking carrier (corresponds to a conveyor device in the form of a chucking device); and
 a controller (corresponds to a processor unit) (see Fig. 3). As shown in Figure 2, a plurality of trays are vertically aligned in each handler.

By way of review, Cochran discloses green sheets are taken out from a plurality of trays, aligned by an alignment pins plate, and are finally stacked by a stacking carrier. However, Cochran does not disclose that the ceramic green sheet is laminated while the pins extend through pin insertion holes in the green sheets on the laminator, and Cochran does not disclose that the carrier film is peeled off and discharged after the ceramic green sheet is pressed, as recited in Claims 1, 5 and 6.

The Official Action does not rely on Anzelone or Ando to cure the deficiencies in Cochran. The Official Action further acknowledges that Cochran does not teach "a rack into which the trays are vertically aligned or vertically movable, tray drawer device for drawing trays from the rack, and rails to guide a tray drawing operation." (page 4, last paragraph). To remedy these deficiencies, the Official Action states:

IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (Anzelone et al.) teach that the handler for transfer of greensheets from trays to an orientor is provided as a magazine containing trays in which green sheets are located. Upon computer demand, the magazine is raised or lowered (see direction arrows in Figure 1) to a proper cavity location in which gripper assembly 4 grips and moves a given tray from the magazine to

orientor for removal by a transfer head. Various process equipment is under computer order makeup control.

By way of review, Anzelone discloses that a magazine including a plurality of trays that contain green sheets is vertically driven, and that a desired tray is drawn into an orientor so that a green sheet can be taken out. Ando discloses a mechanism that prevents double feeding of ceramic green sheets, but does not disclose the claim features missing from Cochran. That is, neither Anzelone nor Ando disclose that the ceramic green sheet is laminated while the pins extend therethrough, and that the carrier film is peeled off and discharged after the ceramic green sheet is pressed, as recited in Claims 1, 5 and 6.

At least because the claim features of each ceramic green sheet lined with a carrier film, where each carrier film has the pin insertion holes extending therethrough, that the pin insertion holes are formed in each carrier film beforehand, that the ceramic green sheet lined with the carrier sheet is positioned by the guide pins while laminating, and that the carrier film is peeled off and discharged after the ceramic green sheet is pressed, are not disclosed by the cited combination, Claims 1, 5 and 6 are patentable over Cochran in view of Anzelone and Ando.

Since ceramic green sheets are low in strength, they are stacked while each ceramic green sheet is lined with a carrier sheet, and therefore, will not be torn. This allows precise positioning with reference to the pins. Moreover, since the mechanism for peeling and discharging the carrier film after compression bonding is provided, electronic monolithic ceramic components can be manufactured efficiently.

Since neither Cochran, Anzelone nor Ando show, teach or suggest the green sheets lined with carrier film having pin insertion holes to be positioned on guide pins of the laminator while laminating, nor the carrier film peeled off and discharged after

the ceramic green sheet is pressed by a compression bonder as claimed in Claims 1, 5 and 6, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 3 and 7-12 depend from Claims 1, 5 and 6 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3 and 7-12 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Cochran in view of Anzelone and Ando at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claims 3 and 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Conclusion:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: September 11, 2007

By:



Charles A. Greene
Registration No. 55,223

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
(703) 836 6620